Research Policy - Article accepted for publication on 17 Sep 2017

Framing inclusive innovation within the discourse of development: insights from case studies in India

Mario Pansera
University of Bristol
Department of Management
Priory Road Complex
Priory Rd, Bristol
BS8 1TU, U.K.
mario.pansera@bristol.ac.uk

Richard Owen
University of Bristol
Department of Management
Priory Road Complex
Priory Rd, Bristol
BS8 1TU, U.K.
richard.owen@bristol.ac.uk

Abstract

The concept of 'inclusive innovation' for development has become increasingly prominent in both academic and policy discourses, raising important questions as to how this is being framed. Results from case studies conducted in India suggest inclusive innovation to be interpretively flexible and contested. One case presents a grassroots framing emphasising social and political empowerment, rooted in community self-sufficiency, autonomy and traditional belief systems. In contrast, the other cases co-opt the language of inclusion to present a predominantly market-based framing, heavily emphasising market readiness and participation. This framing is transforming rural social practices (including the organisation of space and time, the meaning of production and the role of women), introducing the potential for market dependency.

Keywords: inclusive innovation; development; discourse, markets

Highlights

- We study how inclusive innovation is being framed in the broader discourse of development
- Results from case studies in India suggest contestation and differing normative stances
- In one case inclusive innovation is framed as an instrument for social and political empowerment
- In the other cases inclusive innovation aims to foster market readiness and participation
- This is transforming the organisation of space and time, the role of women and meaning of production

1 Introduction

The intersection between innovation, development and poverty alleviation is attracting the interest of an increasing number of scholars in the fields of business, management and research and innovation policy. These include those interested in technology transfer and absorption aimed at the process of 'catching-up' with advanced industrial countries e.g., (Fu et al., 2011) and those focused on building up innovation systems i.e. the institutional and infrastructural environments considered necessary to make innovation flourish e.g., (Lundvall et al., 2009). Until the end of the 1990s the topic of development had gone largely under the radar of these scholars, however this

has now dramatically changed. New terms such as 'frugal innovation', 'reverse innovation', 'Jugaad[1] innovation', 'Bottom of the Pyramid[2] (BOP) innovation', 'Gandhian innovation', 'pro-poor vs. from-the-poor innovation', 'long tail and long tailoring innovation', 'below-the-radar innovation' and, notably, 'inclusive innovation' have proliferated in abundance (Chataway et al., 2014; Kolk et al., 2013; Levidow and Papaioannou, 2017; Pansera, 2013; Sonne, 2012). In the context of developing countries the focus of such forms of experimentation (Fejerskov, 2017) has included the global value chain (Kaplinsky, 2000) and the potential for innovation to open up under-exploited markets e.g. by multinational corporations (MNCs) (Prahalad, 2010) or, in contrast, the emergence of indigenous, grassroots forms of innovation (Smith et al., 2014). They all consider enhancing innovation capacity to be an important element of development, often advocating an inclusive approach (George et al., 2012; Heeks et al., 2014) that in some cases may also offer profitable opportunities for companies and entrepreneurs (London and Hart, 2011).

These perspectives are diverse, contested and often competing. One influential body of literature aligns with what we may describe as a 'market-based' approach (Pansera, 2013; Pansera and Owen, 2015). This emphasises free market dynamics and private enterprise, where innovation is aimed at co-production of profit with social goods, often mediated through MNCs (Prahalad, 2010), or alliances between them and stakeholders (Arora and Romijn, 2011). In contrast, a small but significant number of scholars challenge or directly oppose this approach, sometimes radically so. These echo long standing debates extending back at least to the seminal work of Schumacher in the 1970s on 'intermediate' or 'appropriate technology', which privilege people over markets (Schumacher, 1973). According to Schumacher, the quest for developing countries to 'catch up' by making a technological leap could, paradoxically, increase inequality and poverty. Technology was seen as being a partial and temporary solution to problems that are fundamentally social (Smith, 2005) and political (Papaioannou, 2011). Extensions to Schumacher's ideas include contemporary innovation in the developing world carried out in informal settings by grassroots movements as a reaction to social injustices and environmental problems, sometimes themselves perceived as being caused by free-market ideology (Smith et al., 2014). These contrasting perspectives, which we may describe as a 'grassroots approach', call for alternative patterns of

[1] Jugaad is a colloquial Hindi term literally meaning a hack. It is generally used as word to represent an innovative fix or a simple work-around (Singh et al., 2012).

[2] The notion 'Bottom of the Pyramid (BOP)' usually indicates those nominally living on less than 2 US dollars per day (Prahalad, 2010).

innovation and development in which the voices of the poor are seriously included (Abrol, 2005; Dagnino, 2009)..

What these differing innovation perspectives share is an emphasis on *inclusion*, which we suggest now presents a potentially important discursive bridge linking innovation and development (Heeks et al 2014, Fig 3). But while the concept of inclusive innovation for development has become increasingly prominent in academic (ibid, Fig 1) and research and innovation policy circles e.g. (Johnson and Andersen, 2012; OECD, 2015, 2012; Utz and Dahlman, 2007; World Bank, 2012) it remains a 'weakly defined area of enquiry [with a] lacuna of robust data to support the development of an evidence – based policy agenda' (Chataway et al, 2014, p39). How inclusion is being framed remains little explored, particularly from an empirical perspective. In this respect the politics of inclusion (and of inclusive innovation) we argue should be opened up to critical enquiry (Oudheusden 2014, p72; (Levidow and Papaioannou, 2017)), supporting 'a more reflective point of departure for policy that seeks first to understand the actors, perspectives, and politics of inclusive innovation' (Heeks et al, 2014, p 183). In this regard we seek to understand how discourses of inclusive innovation for development are being constructed in the field, how these are being translated within different organisational and institutional networks, the differing normative stances that underpin them and the impacts they may be having on the ground.

The paper is structured as follows: we first introduce a critical perspective on the innovation and development discourse based on a post-development, reflexive stance, and then investigate the framing of inclusive innovation in three case studies conducted in India. We conclude with a critical discussion concerning how discourses of inclusive innovation are being constructed in the field and the impacts these may be having on rural life and ways of being.

2 Theoretical background

Since the Second World War and the demise of the colonial project the term 'innovation' has become progressively domesticated within the overarching discourse of progress and modernization that has become known as 'development'. Aiming to establish Western-style industrial economies (Sachs, 2010), the fostering in the 'Third World' of institutions such as the democratic nation state, programmes of education and regulatory bodies designed in part to

facilitate the creation of national and international markets became a political priority for development (Escobar, 2012; Ferguson, 1990; Rist, 2011; Sachs, 2010). Within this ideological and political framework, science and technology have occupied a special place, being the means by which industrial productivity and economic growth could be increased. An interconnected system of machines, routines, experts and managers, underpinned by access to abundant natural resources and an entrepreneurial and innovative mind-set, would drive growth and development as an ameliorative and socially transformative process, mediated through the logic of scientific rationality. Wallerstein (2004 p.10) described this process of development in terms of a 'theory of stages', where 'the separate units - national societies - all developed in the same fundamental way but at distinct paces".

Since the 1970s there has been a progressive shift from a macroeconomic focus based largely on state (donor) -led, institution building initiatives, often involving finance and technology transfer from North to South, to a more granular approach more directly focused on local, situated interventions (Escobar, 2012; Rist, 2011). These often encompass a wider range of funding sources (such as private foundations) and stakeholders (such as NGOs, local communities and social enterprises). The rise of the Western neoliberal agenda in the 1980s was an important turning point, promoting the idea that development should be a spontaneous phenomenon that occurs best when the endogenous, productive forces of society are free to act. The so-called 'Washington Consensus' imposed a policy of 'structural adjustment', with the liberalization of trade, removal of tariff barriers and the privatization of several sectors of national economies (Rodrik, 2006). The neoliberal turn radically changed the way development interventions were framed and delivered and opened the door for business and management scholars to treat development as a legitimate object of study. Philanthrocapitalists, with 'an innate belief in societal progress through technological innovation', (Fejerskov, 2017, p 953) emerged as prominent actors. Interventions aimed at innovation and entrepreneurial dynamism paved the way for private foundations, corporations and synergies between these and the state to fight poverty, spur modernisation and development (Leal, 2007). Inspired at least in part by what Levidow and Papaioannou (2017) describe as a 'liberal-individualist' mind-set, the poor could now be now positioned as consumers (Prahalad, 2010), entrepreneurs (London and Hart, 2011) and aspirational, 'successful individuals' (Yunus, 2010). Previously ignored rural backwaters became promising markets with untapped potential (Smith 2002, p 98). An ever expanding literature from business and management scholars

led to the cross-fertilisation of the language of business and innovation into the lexicon of development and discourse of practitioners in the field (Krause 2013).

The project of development, and the innovation turn within this, has been the subject of extensive critique. The instrumental view that more technology and innovation is always better was tempered by criticism that this neglected their political constitution (e.g. Winner 1980) treating them un-reflexively as a powerful but agnostic and apolitical force for good. Arguing against 'the tragic fallacy that modern technologies possess the innocence of tools' (Sachs 1990 p.14) and increasingly the subject of a growing, critical discipline of science and technology scholarship, critics cautioned against ignoring the socially-constructed nature of technologies and their ethical and political entanglements (unintentionally or by design). Questions of power, political economy, the broader impacts of development interventions and who gains and who loses (distributive and intergenerational justice) reflected the increasingly contested nature of the development discourse and the roles of science, innovation and technological change therein (e.g. Leach et al. 2008). Critics for example have argued that the 'market-based' approach tends to frame poverty and exclusion in management terms as an engineering and delivery issue. By leveraging a depoliticised rhetoric of inclusion and market participation, critics argue, it neglects the power relations that shape the processes and impacts of technological change and innovation on the ground, whilst side lining the socio-economic causes of poverty and exclusion (Arora and Romijn, 2011; Levidow and Papaioannou, 2017;Peredo, 2012;) echoing arguments made earlier by Schumacher.

A number of alternative framings have been proposed e.g. (Abrol, 2014; Dagnino, 2009; Smith et al., 2014), notably including grassroots innovations 'that are socially inclusive towards local communities in terms of the knowledge, processes and outcomes involved' (Smith et al. 2014 p. 114). Advocates such as Gupta (2012) contend that all communities, including the poor, have an innate capacity for innovation to solve the problems they themselves face (Gupta et al., 2003). According to this view, rather than tapping underserved consumers, grassroots innovators aspire to address problems that are essentially and primarily social (Smith, 2005) providing appropriate (Gupta et al., 2003), socially desirable (Srinivas and Sutz, 2008) and environmentally sustainable (Gupta, 2010) solutions. According to Gupta (2009) and Fressoli et al. (2014), including grassroots innovation within the range of policy options goes beyond the mere delivery of affordable products/services, to include the strengthening of civil society organizations, empowerment of local communities, filling of institutional voids and, as Papaioannou (2011) suggests, the

promotion of more equitable patterns of development. What concretely distinguishes those approaches from the market-based framing above is their overtly political characterisation.

Proponents of grassroots innovation arguably strive to assert a new way of framing technologies and innovation towards development based on principles that include social justice, cooperation, community empowerment and democracy (Fressoli et al., 2014). Based on insights described by these authors, one can broadly compare the features of what they describe as 'mainstream science, technology and innovation', (market–based) framings with grassroots framings of innovation for development. As discussed above, whilst the goals of the former tend to be coproduction of social goods with economic growth and profit, facilitated by inclusion of the poor into the market economy (i.e. a growth based and market-led worldview) those of the latter are often described in terms of social justice, community empowerment and environmental conflict resolution/sustainability. Whilst market based framings tend to be underpinned by western scientific and technical forms of knowledge, grassroots framings additionally, or alternatively, privilege indigenous forms of knowledge, emphasising grassroots ingenuity, empowerment and structural transformation (Smith et al 2014). Market-based framings tend to emphasise the role of MNCs, social enterprises and entrepreneurs, whilst grassroots framings emphasise the role of local communities, NGOs, social movements and co-operatives. In both framings inclusion of the poor is a key principle and goal.

The reality on the ground is however far more complex and likely to be a continuum between these two extremes, with considerable discursive hybridisation (Chataway et al, 2014; Pansera & Owen 2015), involving 'insertion' modes of engagement between grassroots and the mainstream (Fressoli et al, 2014). We concur with these authors that there may be significant narrative diversity, in turn suggesting that the intersection between innovation, inclusion and development, in a Foucauldian sense (Foucault, 1984), is the location of an ongoing debate that reflects the co-existence of different motivations, values, ideological positions and world views (Papaioannou, 2014). Innovation we suggest assumes the characteristics of a buzzword that is itself surrounded by a constellation of other buzzwords, creating umbrella terms (Rip and Voß, 2013) which serve the purpose of connecting previously distant discursive worlds (e.g. innovation, development and inclusion) and in doing so promoting different normative agendas. Much of this extant literature however remains theoretical and is not informed by the reporting of practices on the ground. In the following we therefore explore these contested discourses of innovation, inclusion and development within three case studies conducted in India.

3 Research design and methods

3.1 Research setting

India presents a fascinating research setting to investigate how inclusive innovation is being absorbed and translated into different kinds of organizational/institutional contexts in the developing world. After independence, three major political traditions struggled for affirmation, associated with three very different world views concerning science, technology and development (Abrol, 2014). Briefly, the Gandhian philosophy, based on the self-reliant village economy and local democracy, was opposed to the notion of centralised power characteristic of the classical European national state (Gandhi, 2008). Opposing the grand narrative of industrial progress that had gained momentum in the post-WWII period, it instead advocated decentralised development based on indigenous, traditional and local knowledge, setting the scene for what would become the Appropriate Technology Movement.

In contrast, the Nehruvian policy for development, which laid the foundations for the market-based innovation approach discussed in Section 2 above, advocated establishment of a strong national industry, modernisation of the agricultural sector and endogenous economic growth through quasi, state-planned capitalism (Nehru, 2004). This often adopted a strategy of replication and imitation of foreign technology. Finally, the Leftist tradition, influenced by Marxist and anti-imperialist positions, advocated establishment of centrally coordinated, large technological systems managed by the workers. It supported a radical distribution of assets (especially land), the creation of modernised heavy industry, the modernization of agriculture through the 'green revolution' and the construction of large, state-funded infrastructures to foster economic growth. This was far from an organised movement and in some cases, as in the Southern state of Kerala, the Left was amenable to a more decentralised planning approach based on the promotion of technological models for local economic development, i.e. a more Ghandian vision (Parameswaran, 2013).

Whilst during the 1950s the negotiation between national planning and self-reliance positions was still visible within the political leadership of the time (Abrol, 2014), incremental technological upgrading of the traditional manufacturing sector and heavy industrialisation became a consistent feature of the first Nehruvian government, consolidated further after the economic crisis of the 1960s. The re-introduction of a more Gandhian tradition after the elections of 1967 allowed the appropriate technology movement to gain momentum, especially in the states of Kerala and West Bengal. In the 1980s neoliberalism came to occupy a dominant position within the government

and academic institutions which remains to this day: the Gandhian and Left traditions, from which the grassroots innovation approaches discussed in Section 2 emerged, are now represented by only a small minority. In this new political environment, those activists advocating for grassroots innovation have called for a return to a decentralised, community-based way of using technology and innovation to improve the lives of the Indian poor (e.g. see (Abrol 2014) and (Gupta 2012)). In contrast, those advocating a more market-based inclusive innovation agenda have increasingly used the rhetoric of the BOP (and other buzzwords such as reverse, frugal and jugaad innovation) to frame the Indian poor as unserved customers who could improve their lives by being included in the market economy.

3.2 Data collection

We adopted an information-oriented, maximum variation case selection strategy (Flyvbjerg, 2006), one that allowed us to cover a relevant portion of the discourses of innovation, inclusion and development described in Section 2 above. Our first case focused on a social enterprise called Mother Earth, which brings rural artisanal products to the market. For our second case, we selected the networks of the Indian Institutes of Management (IIM), which have been active since the 1970s to promote Western management practices in the country, and within these the IIM-Bangalore which offers a well-structured module on Inclusive Business Models and a social enterprise incubator. We contrasted these with a case study of the People Science Movements, a melange of Marxist/Gandhian activists present in many public universities in the country which favours community based, grassroots innovation.

We used qualitative methods since these have been widely selected for researching innovation in non-Western settings, allowing the researcher to uncover and explore relationships in complex environments, disclosing the influence of the social and cultural context upon the unit of analysis (Shah and Corley, 2006; Smith and Seward, 2009). Reflecting this, we employed a method based on an ethnographic mode of enquiry using non-participant observation (van Maanen, 1988), reflexive analysis (Czarniawska, 2007) and micro-ethnographic techniques (Neyland, 2008). The main source of data consisted of audio-recorded, semi-structured interviews collected in the field between August and December 2013. The data were then triangulated with internal documents, non-participant observation, visual data i.e. photos and videos and field notes (see Appendix A).

The data were analysed with the aid of NVivo 9 software, which is widely used to analyse heterogeneous, qualitative datasets (Miles and Huberman, 2003), through a process of iteration,

contextualised within an emerging structure of theoretical reasoning (Gioia et al., 2012). This grounded theory approach follows an inductive logic based on: (i) initial open data coding, maintaining the integrity of 1st-order (informant-centric) terms; (ii) organisation of 1st-order codes into 2nd-order (theory-centric) constructs; (iii) distillation of 2nd-order constructs into overarching aggregate dimensions; (iv) presentation of the data in a narrative fashion.

4 Research findings

4.1. Case 1: Mother Earth: positional innovation for market engagement

Mother Earth (ME) arose in 2011 from Industree Crafts, a social enterprise founded in 1994 to support rural artisans that were considered a sunset sector by the government (Clingingsmith and Williamson, 2004). In common with other social enterprises such as Fabindia (Ramachandran et al., 2012) its vision was to lever urban markets to create demand for Indian rural crafts, reshaping them in a contemporary fashion. In 2011 ME opened its first flagship store in Bangalore, by 2013 it had 6 shops and 250 employees, with significant growth plans. ME's business model is based on a nationally-distributed network of Self-Help Groups (SHGs), an idea borrowed from Grameen Bank, which popularised the creation of women SHGs and micro-credit loans to set up small businesses in rural Bangladesh (Swain and Varghese, 2009; Pansera and Owen 2015). Each SHG of 10-20 individuals shares the risks and benefits as small entrepreneurial ventures. The SHG is a formula that makes the artisans visible to, and engages them with, the institutions of the formal market economy. Composed mainly of women living in rural or peri-urban areas, they elect their own leaders who are in charge of providing the raw materials for production and act as an interface between the company and the SHG. According to ME's founders, the SHG model is designed to maintain people in their traditional rural settings, preventing urban migration.

Innovation at ME is an example of what Tidd and Bessant (2009) describe as 'positional innovation', here repositioning rural crafts in a different context to open up new markets. The Industree family of enterprises has become a hybrid entity that connects different stakeholders to foster this. Its non-for-profit soul, Industree Foundation, was founded to provide technical training and financial support to groups of rural artisans who were willing to form independent SHGs with the purpose of selling their products to Industree Crafts, the for-profit arm of the

family. There is also considerable product innovation (e.g. innovation of new natural fibre products and designs) and process innovation (e.g. new processes for fibre manufacture, through introduction of low-tech machinery designed by ME engineers to clean, dye and weave natural fibres, or upgrades of pre-existing technology). Through this combination of innovative approaches ME has created a niche for products using natural fibres, exporting to over 25 countries in Europe and the United States. The products, manufactured following traditional techniques, are designed, branded and marketed by ME, which now offers a huge range of apparel, furniture, natural fibre objects, home linen, crockery and accessories[3].

4.1.1. Framing of inclusive innovation

The overarching discourse of inclusive innovation that emerges from the data can be constructed around three aggregate dimensions that centre on making the SHG 'market ready' (see Table 1): *the problems of current modes of rural production; increasing productivity* and *creating ownership and responsibility*. At the base of ME's discourse is the corporate conviction that the rural handicrafts heritage should be preserved not only for cultural-historical reasons but, above all, because of its potential to drive economic development whilst maintaining traditional rural livelihoods. In order to valorise this fading, intangible artisanal capital, villagers are encouraged to engage with new markets (domestic and international) in order to sell their products, repositioning these in innovative ways. However, the current, traditional modes of rural production present problems for market participation and the way of life of the villagers is considered to be an obstacle to the development of their communities.

The traditional, family-based nature of the artisans' production results in the organization of time being strongly influenced by the needs and the dynamics of the households, with handicraft production in many cases being a complementary activity that supports other activities (mainly farming). Social, religious and cultural events and obligations are often prioritised over production. According to the interviewees, a typical habit in traditional communities is for example the customisation of symbolic objects to establish or reinforce certain social practices. The ancient art of *sheetal pati* for example, which is a traditional technique to weave natural fibres, requires the

[3] http://motherearth.co.in/ (accessed on 6/11/16)

artisan to pray during the entire manufacturing time, resulting in a highly personalised object which has the blessing of the maker.

Handicraft production traditionally happens in the home. But in order for production to be market-ready and market-efficient, these domestic activities are considered as being isolated, distributed, non-uniform and not amenable to effective management: they inhibit or interfere with market-oriented production. As a consequence, these traditional modes of production are perceived as creating *productivity bottlenecks* that hinder the stability, efficiency and sustainability of the value chain of companies like ME, which needs to be market-ready. Given the perceived limits of traditional production approaches, ME sees a need to transform the way rural artisans live and produce through inclusive innovation that fosters market participation. *Increasing productivity* becomes crucial, achieved through *the rearrangement of time and space* that in total *changes the meaning of production* in rural settings. In order to produce large volumes of items of sufficient and consistent quality, production is centralised and controlled under one roof, where it can be managed and enhanced, supported by the upgrading of traditional machinery e.g. looms (i.e. technical innovation) and organization of (mainly) women into production lines (i.e. organizational/process innovation). A new *meaning of production* for villagers is constructed around the concept of market commodity i.e. something produced with the primary objective of entering domestic or international value chains and markets, whereas previously such artefacts were made largely for religious or other social and cultural purposes, or for seasonal local markets.

In ME's view, the reorganisation of space and time in rural life is part of an *educating mission*. Villagers are required to relocate, plan and manage their activities to meet deadlines, boost efficiency, save costs and maximise time. In order to do this, as many of the interviewees stated, villagers need to be *educated* by ME. ME staff actively promote the reorganization of space and time through education and training, planning, control and assessment of production lines. In many cases, income is positioned as being dependent on the way villagers use (or waste) their time:

> *'We analyse together their activities and how they work…We have to make them feel that they have wasted time. If you did it efficiently, instead of this one week work you could have done in 2 days work'. ME production Manager*

Table 1. Mother Earth Case

Aggregate Dimension	2nd Order Construct	Representative Quotes Underlying Second-Order Constructs
Problems of current rural modes of production	Limits of traditional production approaches	"Rural production is uneconomic. Unless you provide employment for these people at village level they all are going to migrate to the city. […] One of the ways to keep the country economically and environmentally viable is to keep those people in the villages. So that's what we do" (Mother Earth co-founder) "Village lifestyle is very relaxed. When I go into a village what I really do is trying to force them into the productivity mentality" (Mother Earth fieldworker) "if you are working in a village, your festivals, marriages, all those are very important. So you cannot force the community to stay in the production, if somebody dies everybody has to go to. So your entire production is dead" (Mother Earth production manager) "Production and exchange of symbolic objects such the sheetal pati in traditional communities all over the country is usually used to establish or reinforce certain social linkages rather than generating income" (Mother Earth production manager) "[...] they cannot plan. They don't know to plan, there is no forecast planning, so whenever they see physically it happened then only then they move to the next task. There is no planning. […]" (Mother Earth fieldworker) "They are able to work but not in an organized way. That is a kind of problem" (Mother Earth production manager)
	Productivity bottlenecks	"But productivity… they don't understand…. they don't understand the costing and the organization of tasks… If they understood the costing… then they would try to change their positions" (Mother Earth fieldworker) "They don't understand what productivity is… they want to do the work and get paid from us… that's the challenge we have… not all organization having this kind of challenge…" (Mother Earth value-chain manager)
Increasing productivity	Re-arranging time, space and meaning of production	"We make them hire a common working centre, like a shed and we place them in there. We link them to loans institutions, like social microfinance people and then we make them purchase machinery, table and tools and gave design and ask them to work on that design" (Mother Earth fieldworker) "It became very clear to me that if we wanted to work with the artisans we needed to move them up in the value chain. They have to become their own production supervisors, their own managers." (Mother Earth co-founder)
	Educating mission	"For this reason you see in the SHGs many people doing nothing…so they waste time. They don't know how to manage production that's why we have to educate them." (Mother Earth fieldworker) "We tried to teach them that even for very simple distraction they can lose hours of work and lose money" (Mother Earth fieldworker)
Creating ownership & responsibility	Self-empowerment	"It is your production to start, it is not my production. I'm not running this company for me. I'm running this company for you, to give you a market" (Mother Earth co-founder) "But to get this awareness they should be proud. One should say: I'm proud of it. Yes, I'm proud of making this product for Ikea. He should understand that is giving and receiving. So this kind of attitude makes them sit and work" (Mother Earth production manager)
	Self-reliance	"[the biggest obstacle we face on the field is] ownership. Nobody wants to own anything, they all want jobs. […] You tell them, you own this unit… they do not want to take the responsibility of owning the unit." (Mother Earth co-founder)

"Especially women. Women do not want any additional responsibility." (Mother Earth co-founder)

These re-arrangements become routinized as embedded social practices in rural communities, having a transformative impact on rural life, particularly for women.

The SHG is the construct that allows the formalization of rural production within the canon of the formal, market economy, underpinned by principles such as *self-empowerment and self-reliance,* as part of a commitment to *creating responsibility* and *ownership*. In order to support this transformation, ME acts as a key intermediary between rural producers and both domestic and global markets, creating an ecosystem designed to interconnect and manage the necessary functions of innovation, training, organisation and management and the development of approaches for increasing productivity and financial credit. In this framing the buzzword of inclusion is key: ME frames its mission as being an 'inclusive business' where rural development is based on inclusive innovation i.e. product and process innovations that include rural artisans and boost their productivity, combined with 'positional innovation' to enable the offer of traditional products with a modern design to domestic and international markets. Inclusive innovation enables market readiness and participation by leveraging other buzzwords such as *productivity, efficiency, empowerment of women, self-help, ownership* and *responsibility*.

4.2. Case 2: The IIM-B: innovation for inclusive business

Founded in 1973, the Indian Institute for Management (Bangalore) (IIM-B) is part of a network of management institutes founded by the central government in 1961. Inspired by the model of the most prestigious North American business schools it aims to fulfil the demand for highly specialised managers in the Indian private sector (Balasubramanian 1999). The IIMB offers courses on inclusive business models and innovation management. Faculty maintain professional contacts with the Indian corporate and industrial establishment. Moreover, its enterprise incubator, the N S Raghavan Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning (NSRCEL), encourages the creation of innovation-driven start-ups based on values of inclusion and social responsibility. To date, the incubator has supported several social enterprise start-ups oriented towards the problems of the rural poor. These have included significant product innovations (e.g. new affordable construction materials, new electrical devices), service innovations (e.g. a web platform for rural artisans to sell their products); and, similar to ME, positional innovations (e.g. repositioning traditional handicrafts for new markets).

4.2.1. Framing of inclusive innovation

Three themes emerge from the data: the *mission of academia* in a non-western environment framed as a modernity project and with a focus on *transformative innovation systems* as a crucial element for development; and, associated with this, the narrative of '*inclusive business models'* (see Table 2).

The original mission of the institute was to create an elite of highly-skilled managers to lead the economic development of the country. By adopting a foreign managerial culture, the IIMB tends to conform to a western-based development agenda. Its original role, as emerges from the interviews, was to boost Indian economic development by absorbing managerial practices developed in the West, creating an environment in which entrepreneurship and innovation could flourish. As a 'modernity project' its educating mission is to spread among Indian elites a business culture founded on Western-oriented principles of the market economy, technological innovation, universal welfare and state regulation. Moreover, as some of the interviewees clearly stated, one of the most important roles of the institute's network is to connect this 'modernity imaginary' with the world of practitioners, reshaping the way business is carried out in India.

In order to pursue this, the institute seeks to transform the social-cultural factors that are perceived as hampering the creation of an ecosystem of policies, research centres and firms in which innovation can emerge. The core factor hampering the creation of functioning innovation systems in India, according to the interviewees, is a business culture based mostly on 'maintenance' i.e. small temporary adjustments and incremental change rather than new, disruptive innovations. This attitude, often referred to as jugaad, it is argued risks encumbering the emergence of productive and functioning innovation systems able to compete on global markets. In this narrative, India is depicted as having a conservative culture (incremental innovation in a 'maintenance' mode in the informants' words) and incubators like the NSRCEL aim to provide technology, infrastructures and financial aid to those entrepreneurs willing to escape the structural stagnation of India's non-functioning innovation systems (i.e. a transition from jugaad to systemic innovation).

This however is often a source of conflict and, as a result, a co- existing, countervailing narrative also emerges from the interviews that questions, with difference nuances, the basic assumptions of Western theories of business organization and management. Within this there is implicit recognition that the processes of development and modernization have not delivered the outcomes they originally promised, in particular for the marginalised sectors of Indian society. Tensions exist between the imposition of a postcolonial intellectual discourse and the necessity to elaborate an 'Indian way to modernity', from which the concepts of inclusive innovation and

inclusive business models have emerged, connecting the Indian managerial elite and corporate sector to the problems of the poor. Mediated through the principle of inclusion, innovation and social enterprise have become domesticated within the discourse of inclusive business, particularly in the NSRCEL. A neoliberal but 'Indianised' market-oriented ideology emerges, where the private sector can address the issues of poverty and development, which are framed *as a delivery issue* i.e. one which must address the mismatch between the demands of the poor and the market offer. This market-based approach they argue differs from the approach that has characterised many social responsibility actions to date, by focussing on the organisational and managerial skills needed to foster inclusive innovation to promote development and achieve financial sustainability. This framing emphasises the normative assumption that it is possible to find a technical fix to solve poverty with a technocratic orientation and innovative knowledge economy being seen as important for development (Fejerskov, 2017; Sarewitz and Nelson, 2008). This market-based framing of inclusive innovation leverages buzzwords that include *financial sustainability, inclusive business and social enterprise*.

Table 2. IIMB /NSRCEL Case

Aggregate Dimension	2nd Order Construct	Representative Quotes Underlying Second-Order Constructs
The mission of academia	Modernity project	"IIMB is a modernity project. It was created to train the techno-managerial elites of the country" (IIMB faculty) "In general the training and all the MBA courses are mainly western-driven; there is no doubt about it" (IIMB start-up CEO) "So all societies are different […] but broadly modernity means embracing these [market economy, technology, universal welfare, state regulation]. […] Today there is more unanimity in the world about this. We need to be modern." (IIMB faculty)
	Educating mission	"We make [theory] digestible to people" (NRSCEL director) "The role of the IIMB/NSRCEL has a dual function: it connects managerial knowledge to the world of practitioners on one hand and contributes to spreading and reproducing a business culture on the other" (NRSCEL director)
Transformative Innovation systems	Escaping innovation as maintenance	"The entire culture of India's tradition of resource management was based on innovation in maintenance. It was not based on innovation in terms of new creations. Maintain…. Keep it. […] That is what people now call jugaad." (IIMB faculty) "India is a country of family businesses that are essentially owned by people that have been traders for generations before becoming industrialists. As a consequence, innovation in India is synonymous either with the imported/adapted foreign technology of big industry or of the 'maintenance' attitude of jugaad" (IIMB faculty)
	From jugaad to systemic innovation	"During the season of economic reforms that started in 1991 […] Indian companies found themselves alone in facing the competition from technologically advanced companies coming from abroad […]. This shocked the Indian business ecosystem, and it started thinking that the development of indigenous capabilities was crucial to survival. As a result, from the decade of the 1990s the notion of 'innovation management' slowly started to diffuse in the Indian private sector." (IIMB faculty) "Nowadays innovation centres, incubators or accelerators are mushrooming in the country. Virtually every IIM has its own centre for innovation and business incubation." (IIMB faculty)
Inclusive business models	Poverty as delivery problem	"My aspiration is to solve India's problems with technology" (NRSCEL angel investor) "The failure in addressing the problems caused by poverty is not due to a lack of funds but is a delivery issue, a mismatch between the offer of the market and the needs of the poor." (IIMB faculty)
	An Indianised, market-oriented approach to social responsibility	"[There is] the necessity to connect the present/future managers that are attending the IIMB programmes to the realities facing the Indian poor" (IIMB faculty) "Unlike traditional CSR initiatives, the idea of the inclusive business offers a more proactive image of the private sector that is very far from the paternalistic approach that characterises many social responsibility actions within the corporate sector." (IIMB faculty) "The corporate sector hopes to expand their saturated markets by including the consumers at the BOP" (IIMB faculty)

4.3. Case 3: The People's Science Movements: Science and inclusive innovation for social revolution

The Peoples Science Movements (PSMs) is a network that emerged in India in the early 1960s whose origins can be traced to the numerous educational groups working on the popularization of science in the local languages of India, some of which date back to the pre-independence period (Parameswaran, 2013). Its founders advocated emancipation through the popularization of scientific thinking. They acknowledged that science and technology are embedded in complex social phenomena that include class dynamics, power relationships and cultural structures (Kannan, 1990). By disclosing those relationships, they hoped to use science, technology and innovation as instruments of social struggle in favour of the disadvantaged Indian classes.

4.3.1 Framing of inclusive innovation

From the data analysis three themes emerge (see Table 3): the need to create *pro-poor innovation networks*; the critique of a depoliticised innovation process within the context of a rising neoliberal agenda *(innovation politics)*; and the discourse of science and technology as instruments for *social revolution*.

From its inception the PSMs encouraged scientists and activists to participate in socially-motivated, pro-poor innovations (Varma, 2001). Anchored in a Leftist tradition their normative stance was that the fruits of scientific progress must be shared with the lower sectors of Indian society (Jaffry et al. 1983). By educating people to understand science and technology and by connecting them to the public research institutions of the country, the PSMs aimed to overcome class oppression. They also aimed to strengthen pre-existing networks of production in a manner that could be competitive with MNCs, building networks to deliver practical, usable technologies. By encouraging scientific literacy, discouraging competition in the local economy and encouraging collaboration in networks of rural producers, they aimed to empower the weaker sections of rural society. The practical manifestations of this philosophy are the People's Technology Initiatives (PTIs), a quasi 'proto innovation system' applied to the Indian rural world, which attempt to build technology systems around local knowledge and resources. PTI experiments have been carried out in 16 sectors in 7 Indian states (Abrol, 2004), each initiative involving about 200–300 households

spread over some 30 rural and semi-rural settlements: the economic and social impact of these initiatives remains contested (Abrol, 2006).

Table 3 Peoples Science Movements Case

Aggregate Dimension	2nd Order Construct	Representative Quotes Underlying Second-Order Constructs
Pro-poor innovation networks	Competitive, local networks of production	"We saw local economies as providers of economies of scale. We thought that they could even compete with the transnational corporations and the big business." (Delhi PSMs' activist) "Only the 30% of the Indian poor have some land, but they can do something. They are embedded in networks of production. How do we work with them, how do we empower them? And how do we empower them in a manner that they can actually become competitive to the transnational corporations?" (Delhi PSMs' activist)
	Proto-innovation systems	"Petty producers cannot compete on their own without cooperating among themselves, it is not possible. […] We supersede the Gandhian conception. The KVIC[4] tried to make the individual producer competitive, but they will never be able to compete with the big businesses" (Delhi PSMs' activist) "In the village nothing is made by one artisan. Everything is made by the participation of the whole village and the contributions of the next villages, where there are the capabilities of repairing, maintenance or other kind of services. There is a whole structure of local economy in which the mechanism of the mercantile capital are very weak." (Delhi PSMs' activist) "Gandhi saw [rural people] as individual producers. We started seeing them actually as individual producers being embedded in networks. We use concept of network even before Castells. Before network economy became a rage in the world. Before even the national system of innovation framework came' (Delhi PSMs' activist)
Innovation politics	Innovation as Western discourse	"The role of the state lost its centrality, it became a regulator. So everybody in India started looking at those innovation statistics. They took the Frascati or the Oslo manual, all those innovation surveys that Europe was doing, and started to implement it here" (Delhi PSMs' activist) "We just imported the concept and methodology and then we copied and pasted in India. We dismiss local knowledge and Indian journals… we wanted to publish in the foreign journals. The people in India accepted blindly some flawed concept like measuring innovation […] People are happy because they can count patent […] you can see what the hegemony of Western science has done to us even in the science and technology studies" (Bangalore PSMs' activist)
	Inclusive innovation and business as de-politicisation of development	"In this new season sexy words have created.[…] See this inclusive business concept is adverse inclusion. It is profit seeking and accumulation processes. What is it inclusive business? You increase your market for 10 more consumers in some rural area whom we give a model of mobile which is different from the one used by rich Indian, that's inclusion? We don't want any inclusion, we want equity, and we want empowerment. […] The inclusion in the market means that the dominant power remains where it is' (Kerala PSMs' activist)"

[4] The Khadi and Village Industries Commission (KVIC) is a statutory body formed by the Government of India in 1956 to promote the development of khadi and village industries in the rural areas in coordination with other agencies engaged in rural development (http://www.kvic.org.in/ accessed 7/11/16).

		"[Inclusive innovation] is like a new kind of political project. Within the neoliberal frame you say inclusion, frugal etc. They even use Gandhi […] One day they will use Marx also, for them everything is a commodity" (Delhi PSMs' activist)
Science, technology and innovation for social revolution	Politics of exclusion	"[Inclusive business] is a subsidiary concept. Business needs to be exclusive. It needs to exclude the majority of people […] because that is the only way to make money, because you have to. […] rich are rich because poor are excluded." (Delhi PSMs' activist) "The majority that was getting impoverished were increasingly able to see and understand how the minority is using its knowledge and skills to perpetuate its hegemony and, consequently, resist it more and more effectively. The ultimate success of the majority to stop and reverse this impoverishment is termed as "social revolution" and led to the adoption of the slogans "science for social revolution." (Kerala PSMs' activist)
	Emancipation through activism	"The people have to decide their destiny. For that there should have a weapon to fight against those who are against them. And the weapons should be science. Knowledge, so we have to equip people with the weapon. Namely, knowledge and science." (IRTC activist) "Introducing some scientific literature alone will not work. Whatever we say we have to demonstrate it… make it practicable and bring it to [the poor]. […] Suppose I said you can be self-reliant." (IRTC activist)

The second overarching theme that emerges from the data is a sharp critique of innovation as a depoliticized process. According to PSMs' activists, the rhetoric of innovation portrayed in Western documents (e.g. Frascati and Oslo manual) and practices (e.g. innovation surveys) neglects and often dismisses local, indigenous knowledge. The imported notion of innovation as a 'Western discourse' overlooks the complexity of Indian society and, more importantly, imposes a number of assessment indicators that, by merely focusing on economic performance, neglect the politics of innovation and production on the ground. The PSMs' activists perceive concepts of market-based inclusive business/innovation as being complicit in this depoliticisation. In their view such framings of inclusive innovation serve to position the poor as consumers in a way that does not challenge the social structures that cause inequality and exclusion in the first place. In PSMs' narrative, inclusive business/innovation form 'a new kind of political project' (in the words of an interviewee) that perpetuates industrial capitalism and the social exclusion of the poor.

According to our PSMs' interviewees, by framing poverty and social exclusion as a delivery issue (to be addressed by inclusive innovation and inclusive business models) this neglects the causes of inequality which are, they argue, overtly political. In contrast, PSMs support the emancipation of the rural poor through activism (the third theme). Following a 'Gramscian' philosophy (Crehan, 2011), according to the PSMs, the poor can be emancipated by enhancing the intrinsic rationality that characterises their culture and daily practices. By removing the label of irrationality levelled at traditional beliefs and credos, rural people can live a life based on self-reliance, supported by grassroots technology and innovation, creating local networks of productive units. In order to be competitive with the mainstream industrial system, they also aim to improve the efficiency of rural production through the tools of modern science and technology. PSMs activists advocate a strict collaboration between the public centres of scientific research and the rural poor. Through institutions such as the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) and grassroots organizations such as the Indian Rural Technology Centre in Kerala (IRTC), these aim to preserve the integrity of rural life and ways of being. They offer an alternative to free market capitalism, which (as with the SHGs described in Case 1) embeds the concepts of inclusion and community self-reliance as defining characteristics, but with a very different normative underpinning. Overall the PSMs narrative argues that knowledge can transform the structures that reify inequality within Indian society. In doing so the PSMs' narrative intentionally politicizes science, technology and innovation as instruments of *social revolution*. In PSM's narrative inclusive innovation is intimately bound to a political project of social revolution, leveraging buzzwords that include *social justice, self-*

sufficiency and *communities' empowerment,* an overtly political framing as compared with the previous two cases.

5 Discussion

In the case studies presented above we have aimed to explore how the conjoined buzzwords 'inclusive innovation' are being framed within the contemporary discourse of development. The rise and fall of buzzwords has, according to Cornwall (2007), been an important feature of the evolving discourse of development, sheltering multiple, contested political agendas. Overall our cases suggest that the Indian rural poor lie at the centre of a battleground where many aspire to speak on behalf of their interests in terms of development and the role of science, technology and innovation therein. This discursive trading zone - an expression forged by Galison (1995) to describe the boundaries between two or more discursive worlds - is occupied by diverse actors, some of whom, such as international donors, NGOs, development agencies and development scholars, have been in the arena for decades. Others, such as MNCs, small and medium private companies, social enterprises and business and management scholars, are more recent entrants, facilitated in part by a discursive bridge between innovation and development in which the buzzword inclusion, however framed, is key (Heeks et al, 2014 Fig 3).

We summarise in Table 4 how this dynamic emerges in the cases considered. The framings of inclusive innovation presented are motivated by a mix of social, environmental, cultural, commercial and political goals of e.g. empowerment, raising living standards, sustainability and co-production of profits, set within the situated context in which they find themselves. With regard to the poor's role in the innovation process, the cases present a mix of framings. The role of the poor in the ME case is one of producers or, rather, co-producers for the market (Chataway et al, 2014, p.44). The artisans are framed as skilled workers and the role of the company is not to sell them a product or a service but to connect them with new markets, by providing logistics, design competencies, expertise and market visibility/access. In the case of the IIMB the poor are positioned both as consumers (Chataway et al, 2014, p.42) and as co-producers. Finally, the PSMs appear to frame the poor as empowered agents of change, through networks of self-organising producers. They aim to empower 'poor producers' through the promotion of scientific literacy, the upgrading of rural technology and grassroots innovation to enhance indigenous knowledge, culture and belief systems, anchored in a Leftist ideology with the purpose of social and political empowerment and emancipation.

The three cases differ in the normative stances for inclusive innovation. ME's focus is on the productive capacity of rural artisans in a market frame. According to our ME interviewees, rural producers are unable to compete in global markets because of their limited productivity and the inability to adapt their products to the preferences of e.g. the new emerging Indian middleclass. The underlying assumption is that, in order to preserve traditional skills and rural livelihoods, artisans should become productive and engage with national and global markets. Similarly, the IIMB's assumption is that the majority of Indians live in backward conditions because there is no culture of, or incentives for, innovation and no functioning innovation system. At the same time, poverty is usually seen as a delivery issue. Business models, and innovation within these, can and should be made more inclusive, leading to more equal distribution of social goods. The PSMs' normative position deviates quite strongly from the other cases in that the majority of Indians are seen as being excluded from the benefits of the development project because of oppressive social structures that hamper the equal distribution of social goods. Markets they argue cannot be inclusive and industrial development is an exploitative enterprise that they contend jeopardizes social and environmental integrity. They aim to use science and grassroots innovation to empower the Indian poor as communities of independent producers, augmenting their traditional belief systems. Inspired by what Levidow and Papaioannou (2017) describe as a 'social-collective' mindset, this may be viewed as more of a 'mobilization' mode of encounter of grassroots innovation with the mainstream, with 'resistance of grassroots to incumbent regimes, with the aim of developing pathways towards alternative innovation systems' (Fressoli et al, 2014).

In the three cases inclusion sits within different constellations of buzzwords (Cornwall, 2007). It is in these constellations that the notion of inclusive innovation can assume very different practical implications and outcomes, depending on which relative position – which world view - it occupies. In the ME case inclusive innovation is aimed at increasing *productivity, efficiency, empowerment of women*, *self-help* and a commitment to 'educate' the poor to the notions of *ownership and responsibility*. In the IIMB case, inclusive innovation is associated with buzzwords such as *financial sustainability, inclusive business, inclusive growth* and *social enterprise* whereas in the PSMs' case it is aimed at *social justice, autonomy, self-sufficiency, local communities of producers* and *appropriate technology*.

Table 4 Competing framings of inclusive innovation and development

	Poor's role	Normative Stances	Innovation	Aspired Goal	Constellation of Buzzwords
Mother Earth	*Poor as producers* (of goods in a market economy paradigm)	• Rural handicraft is fading, rural incomes shrinking, artisans must be helped • Rural artisans are not competitive • Rural artisans must compete on domestic and global markets whilst being environmentally and socially sustainable • Villagers must remain in the rural setting • Villagers must be more productive and be 'market ready'	• Product Innovation (e.g. new fibres, new designs) • Process Innovation (e.g. frugal machinery upgrades, new processes for fibre manufacture). • Positional Innovation (new ways for rural artisans to enter and engage with national/global markets)	• Artisans are educated to be competitive, raise productivity, acquire a sense of ownership and access urban markets • Self-help groups allow artisans to be visible to the formal economy • Female empowerment through ownership and responsibility of production • Re-arrangement of time, space and the meaning of production	Inclusive innovation aimed at: Market-readiness; Productivity, efficiency, empowerment of women, self-help, ownership and responsibility
IIMB & NSRCEL	*Poor as consumers and/or producers* in a market economy paradigm underpinned by inclusive business models	• The majority of Indians live in backward conditions because there is no culture of innovation and no incentive to innovate • An Indian way to modernity • Business can be made more inclusive and in doing so lead to a more equal distribution of social goods	• Product Innovation (e.g. new affordable construction materials, new electrical devices) • Service Innovation (e.g. web platform for rural artisans) • Positional Innovation (e.g. re-positioning of traditional handicrafts for the market)	• Individual entrepreneurs or companies able to address poverty and development by developing innovative technologies and business models that are inclusive and financially viable at the same time	Inclusive innovation aimed at: Inclusive business, inclusive growth, social enterprise, financial sustainability
PSMs	*Poor as agents of change,* members of value-driven, self-sufficient community networks	• Majority of Indians are excluded from the benefits of the development project • Oppressing social structures hamper equal distribution of social goods • Markets cannot be inclusive, industrial development is an exploitative enterprise that jeopardizes social and environmental integrity	• Product, process and service innovation (e.g. within PTIs) • Social Innovation (e.g. new forms of organizations to deliver social goods such as literacy, and scientific education) • Paradigm innovation i.e. new forms of autonomy and subsistence based on local knowledge and appropriate technology	• Science, technology and innovation for social and political revolution • Autonomy, self-sufficiency, local communities of producers, appropriate technology	Inclusive innovation aimed at: Social justice, transformation, self-sufficiency, communities' empowerment, and social revolution

In all cases inclusive innovation is positioned as an indispensable element for providing development solutions for the rural poor. In two of the three cases (ME, IIMB), despite discursive hybridisation, what emerges is a strong *connection to the markets* framing, one that shares many characteristics with an overwhelmingly neoliberal agenda e.g. a focus on entrepreneurs as a definition of successful individuals, on consumption or value creation through engagement with domestic and international markets, the rationality of self-interested, economic agents and the rationalization of production within a monetized economy (Gershon, 2011).

The PSMs' case in contrast presents an example of a countervailing framing for inclusive innovation that opposes this 'market-ready' framing, which they consider as, paradoxically, increasing the vulnerability of the poor, exposing them to the volatility of a free market economy and creating new forms of social oppression and dependency (Federici 2001; 2010). Their framing transcends product, process and positional innovation to present a case of what (Tidd & Bessant, 2009) have described as 'paradigm innovation' i.e. changes to the underlying mental models which frame innovation. Within this frame, the term inclusive innovation acquires a very different meaning when compared to its framing in the other two cases. Here the goal is the redistribution of power, where science, technology and innovation are a means to reshape and transform pre-existing social and political structures.

It should be noted that, despite broad alignment of the cases with the categorisation of market–based versus grassroots modes of innovation described by Fressoli et al, (2014) we witnessed overlap and hybridisation (see also Pansera and Owen 2015). This was evident for example in the desire in the ME case to foster female empowerment through the construct of the self-help group, the desire of PSMs' activists to create production networks that can compete with MNCs and the tacit or explicit association with principles of self-help to varying degrees in all 3 cases.

The market-based framing observed in two of the three cases was also prominent in a recent case study we undertook in Bangladesh (Pansera and Owen, 2015) and has been noted by other authors (see for example a recent synthesis by Chataway et al, 2014). This particular framing, we suggest, is having constitutive impacts on rural life through a range of innovations across the product, process and position space. These include the re-organising of space and time to enhance and standardise production observed in our cases, mediated predominantly through the roles and activities of women (see Pansera and Owen, 2015; also observed in affluent societies e.g. (LeBaron, 2010)). We do not argue for or against the view that this re-organization of productive activity

provides benefits for those involved. Rather we simply note that it is having impacts on the social fabric of rural life through a framing that promotes the creation of individuals who are *market engaged* and *market ready* (Scott 1995), aiming to create rational economic women and men who function efficiently in this context and in doing so, it is hypothesised, empower themselves and improve their standard of living. We highlight the discursive power of the umbrella term 'inclusive innovation' in this regard, one which appropriates other buzzwords that include empowerment and self-help to align individual and community goals within a market-ready ideology (Rankin, 2013). We suggest that the rise of this market-ready framing for inclusive innovation could not only have profound social implications but risk marginalising or silencing other framings whilst introducing the potential for hegemony.

6 Conclusions

We have in this paper explored how the umbrella term 'inclusive innovation' is becoming translated on the ground within the broader discourse of development. The cases, we argue, suggest that the notion of inclusive innovation and its near-synonyms never assume a neutral connotation when used in the broader discourse of development. On the contrary, they always embody a political dimension, sometimes implicitly, as in the cases of ME and IIM-B, and sometimes overtly so, as in the case of the PSMs, shaped by the values, normative world views and economic interests of those who advocate them. We suggest that the concept of inclusive innovation, and indeed the field of innovation for development more broadly, stands on highly contested ground. In this contested space, it is important not to generalise from a limited set of case studies. Despite this, we suggest that, while framings are likely to be plural, contested and hybrid, there is strong potential for the emergence of a discourse of inclusive innovation for development that leverages the rhetoric of inclusion in order to privilege Western-style market-oriented approaches. What is interesting about this from a policy perspective is its constitutive impacts on the ground, where a transformation of pre-existing social practices may be occurring and where ideas of time, space and the roles of women are being challenged and reconfigured. There exist countervailing voices that continue to open up debate about the roles of science, innovation and technological change as instruments for development and social and political transformation. However the extent to which these are being overshadowed through a process of discursive exclusion (Escobar, 1984; Foucault, 1984; Nicolini, 2012) in which, paradoxically, the language of inclusion is playing a central role, remains unclear. The extent to which this has the

potential to foster hegemony and market dependency through the exercise of discursive power we suggest also requires further investigation. We conclude by arguing then for further critical research that explores the framing construction, dynamics and impacts of inclusive innovation for development in situated practices in the field, in total providing a richer evidence base for research and innovation policy.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful and constructive comments that contributed to improving the final version of this article. We would also like to thank the precious contributions made by the Mother Earth employees; Profs Rishikesha T Krishnan and Sourav Mukherjee from the IIMB; and the People's Science Movements activists, in particular Prof Dinesh Abrol, and P.M. Parameswaran, for their crucial support in the data collection.

References

Abrol, D., 2014. Pro-poor Innovation-making , knowledge production and technology implementation for rural areas : Lessons from the Indian Experience, in: Ramani, S. (Ed.), Innovation in India: Melting Economic Growth with Inclusive Development. Cambridge University Press, Delhi.

Abrol, D., 2006. Pro-poor Innovation-making : Critical Reflections on the Indian Experience Dinesh Abrol Introduction, in: Lakhvinders Workshop In Patiala. Patiala, pp. 1–26.

Abrol, D., 2005. Embedding technology in community-based production systems through People's Technology Initiatives: Lessons from the Indian experience. Int. J. Technol. Manag. Sustain. Dev. 4, 3–20.

Abrol, D., 2004. Lessons from the design of innovation systems for rural industrial clusters in India. Asian J. Technol. Innov. 12, 67–97.

Arora, S., Romijn, H., 2011. The empty rhetoric of poverty reduction at the base of the pyramid. Organization 19, 481–505.

Chataway, J., Hanlin, R., Kaplinsky, R., 2014. Inclusive innovation: an architecture for policy development. Innov. Dev. 4, 33–54. doi:10.1080/2157930X.2013.876800

Clingingsmith, D., Williamson, J.G., 2004. India's De-Industrialization Under British Rule: New Ideas, New Evidence. Natl. Bur. Econ. Res. Work. Pap. Ser. No. 10586.

Cornwall, A., 2007. Buzzwords and fuzzwords: deconstructing development discourse. Dev. Pract. 17, 471–484.

Crehan, K., 2011. Gramsci's concept of common sense: a useful concept for anthropologists?

Czarniawska, B., 2007. Shadowing: And Other Techniques for Doing Fieldwork in Modern Societies. Liber Copenhagen Business School Press, Copenhagen.

Dagnino, R., 2009. Tecnologia Social: ferramenta para construir outra socieade. Instituto de Geociencias de UNICAMP, Campinas.

Escobar, A., 2012. Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World, 2nd ed. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Escobar, A., 1984. Discourse and power in development: Michel Foucault and the relevance of his work to the Third World. Alternatives 10, 377–400.

Federici, S., 2010. Women, witch-hunting and enclosures in Africa today. Sozial.Geschichte Online 3, 10–27.

Federici, S., 2001. Women, globalization and the international women's movement. Can. J. Dev. Stud. Can. d'études du développement 22, 1025–1036.

Fejerskov, A.M., 2017. The New Technopolitics of Development and the Global South as a Laboratory of Technological Experimentation. Sci. Technol. Hum. Values 42, 947–968. doi:10.1177/0162243917709934

Ferguson, J., 1990. The anti-politics machine:" development," depoliticization, and bureaucratic power in Lesotho. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Flyvbjerg, B., 2006. Five misunderstandings about case-study research, in: Clive Seale, Giampietro Gobo, Jaber F. Gubrium, and D.S. (Ed.), Qualitative Research Practice: Concise Paperback Edition. Sage, London and Thousand Oaks, CA.

Foucault, M., 1984. The Order of Discourse, in: Shapiro, M.J. (Ed.), Language and Politics. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 108–39.

Fressoli, M., Arond, E., Abrol, D., Smith, A., Ely, A., Dias, R., 2014. When grassroots innovation movements encounter mainstream institutions: implications for models of inclusive innovation. Innov. Dev. 4, 277–292.

Fu, X., Pietrobelli, C., Soete, L., 2011. The Role of Foreign Technology and Indigenous Innovation in the Emerging Economies: Technological Change and Catching-up. World Dev. 39, 1204–1212.

Galison, P., 1995. Context and Constraints, in: Scientific Practice: Theories and Stories of Doing Physics. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Gandhi, M., 2008. My experiments with truth: An autobiography. Jaico Publishing House, Mumbai.

George, G., McGahan, A.M., Prabhu, J., Macgahan, A., 2012. Innovation for inclusive growth: towards a theoretical framework and a research agenda. J. Manag. Stud. 49, 662–683.

Gershon, I., 2011. Neoliberal Agency. Curr. Anthropol. 52, 537–555.

Gioia, D.A., Corley, K.G., Hamilton, A.L., 2012. Seeking Qualitative Rigor in Inductive Research: Notes on the Gioia Methodology. Organ. Res. Methods 16, 15–31.

Gupta, A., 2012. Innovations for the poor by the poor. Int. J. Technol. Learn. Innov. Dev. 5, 28–39.

Gupta, A., 2010. Grass green innovations for inclusive, sustainable development, in: Lopez-Claros, A. (Ed.), The Innovation for Development Report. Palgrave Macmillan, New York, pp. 137–146.

Gupta, A., 2009. Seduce the scientist. Farming matters 17.

Gupta, A., Sinha, R., Koradia, D., Patel, R., Parmar, M., Rohit, P., Patel, H., Patel, K., Chand, V.S., James, T.J., Chandan, A., Patel, M., Prakash, T.N., Vivekanandan, P., 2003. Mobilizing grassroots' technological innovations and traditional knowledge, values and institutions: articulating social and ethical capital. Futures 35, 975–987.

Heeks, R., Foster, C., Nugroho, Y., 2014. New models of inclusive innovation for development. Innov. Dev. 4, 175–185.

Jaffry, A., Rangarajan, M., Ekbal, B., Kannan, K.P., 1983. Towards a People's Science Movement. Econ. Polit. Wkly. 18, 372–376.

Johnson, B., Andersen, A.D. (Eds.), 2012. Learning, Innovation and Inclusive Development: New perspectives on economic development strategy and development aid, Vol. 2011/. ed. Globelics Thematic Report, Aalborg.

Kannan, K.P., 1990. Secularism and People's Science Movement in India. Econ. Polit. Wkly. 25, 311–313.

Kaplinsky, R., 2000. Globalisation and Unequalisation: What Can Be Learned from Value Chain Analysis? J. Dev. Stud. 37, 117–146.

Kolk, A., Rivera-Santos, M., Rufin, C., 2013. Reviewing a Decade of Research on the "Base/Bottom of the Pyramid" (BOP) Concept. Bus. Soc. 20, 2–40.

Krause, U., 2013. Innovation: The new Big Push or the Post-Development alternative? Development 56, 223–226.

Leach, M., Sumner, A., Waldman, L., 2008. Discourses, dynamics and disquiet: Multiple knowledges in science, society and development. J. Int. Dev. 20, 727–738.

Leal, P.A., 2007. Participation: the ascendancy of a buzzword in the neo-liberal era. Dev. Pract. 17, 539–548.

LeBaron, G., 2010. The political economy of the household: Neoliberal restructuring, enclosures, and daily life. Rev. Int. Polit. Econ. 17, 889–912. doi:10.1080/09692290903573914

Levidow, L., Papaioannou, T., 2017. Which inclusive innovation? Competing normative assumptions around social justice. Innov. Dev. forthcomin, 1–18. doi:10.1080/2157930X.2017.1351605

London, T., Hart, S. (Eds.), 2011. Next Generation Business Strategies for the Base of the Pyramid. New Approaches for Building Mutual Value. Pearson Education, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.

Lundvall, B., Vang, J., Joseph, K., Chaminade, C., 2009. Bridging Innovation System Research and Development Studies: challenges and research opportunities, in: 7th Globelics Conference, Senegal.

Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M., 2003. Qualitative data analysis : an expanded sourcebook, Second Ed. ed. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Narayanaswamy Balasubramanian (Ed.), 1999. Management Perspectives - Essays on Managerial Priorities and Management Education. Bangalore Indian Institute of Management & Macmillan India, New Delhi.

Nehru, J., 2004. The discovery of India. Penguin Books India, Delhi.

Neyland, D., 2008. Organizational Ethnography, Library Information Science Research. Sage,

London.

Nicolini, D., 2012. Practice Theory, Work, and Organization: An Introduction. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

OECD, 2015. Innovation Policies for Inclusive Growth. OECD Publishing, Paris. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264229488-en

OECD, 2012. Innovation and Inclusive Development. OECD Publishing, Paris.

Oudheusden, M. van, 2014. Where are the politics in responsible innovation? European governance, technology assessments, and beyond. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/23299460.2014.882097 1.

Pansera, M., 2013. Frugality, Grassroots and Inclusiveness : New Challenges for Mainstream Innovation Theories. African J. Sci. Technol. Innov. Dev. 5, 469–478. doi:10.1080/20421338.2013.820445

Pansera, M., Owen, R., 2015. Framing Resource-Constrained Innovation at the "Bottom of the Pyramid": Insights from an ethnographic case study in rural Bangladesh. Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change 92, 300–311. doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2014.10.004

Papaioannou, T., 2014. How inclusive can innovation and development be in the twenty-first century? Innov. Dev. 4, 187–202.

Papaioannou, T., 2011. Technological innovation, global justice and politics of development. Prog. Dev. Stud. 11, 321–338.

Parameswaran, M.P. (Ed.), 2013. Science for Social Revolution. A reader. Kerala Sasthra Sahithya Parishath, Thrissur.

Peredo, A., 2012. The BOP Discourse as Capitalist Hegemony. Acad. Manag. Proc. 2012, 1–1. doi:10.5465/AMBPP.2012.274

Prahalad, C.K., 2010. The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid: eradicating poverty through profits, 2nd ed. Pearson Education, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.

Ramachandran, J., Pant, A., Pani, S.K., 2012. Building the BoP Producer Ecosystem: The Evolving Engagement of Fabindia with Indian Handloom Artisans. J. Prod. Innov. Manag. 29, 33–51.

Rankin, K.N., 2013. A critical geography of poverty finance. Third World Q. 34, 547–568.

Rip, A., Voß, J.-P., 2013. Umbrella Terms as Mediators in the Governance of emerging Science and Technology. Sci. Technol. Innov. Stud. 9, 39–59.

Rist, G., 2011. The history of development: from western origins to global faith, Third. ed. Zed Books, London.

Rodrik, D., 2006. Goodbye Washington Consensus, Hello Washington Confusion? A review of the World Bank's Economic Growth in the 1990s: Learning from a Decade of Reform. J. Econ. Lit. 44, 973–987.

Sachs, W. (Ed.), 2010. The development dictionary. Zed Books, New York.

Sachs, W., 1990. The Archeology of the Development Idea. Interculture 23, 2–33.

Sarewitz, D., Nelson, R.R., 2008. Three rules for technological fixes. Nature 456, 871–872.

Schumacher, E.F., 1973. Small is Beautiful. Harper & Row, New York.

Scott, D., 1995. Colonial Governmentality. Soc. Text 191–220.

Shah, S.K., Corley, K.G., 2006. Building Better Theory by Bridging the Quantitative – Qualitative

Divide. J. Manag. Stud. 43, 1821–1835.

Singh, R., Gupta, V., Mondal, A., 2012. Jugaad--From "Making Do" and "Quick Fix" to an Innovative, Sustainable and Low-Cost Survival Strategy at the Bottom of the Pyramid. Int. J. Rural Manag. 8, 87–105.

Smith, A., 2005. The Alternative Technology Movement: An Analysis of its Framing and Negotiation of Technology Development. Hum. Ecol. 12, 106–119.

Smith, A., Fressoli, M., Thomas, H., 2014. Grassroots innovation movements: challenges and contributions. J. Clean. Prod. 63, 114–124.

Smith, L.T., 2002. Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples. Zed books & University of Otago Press, London & New York.

Smith, M.L., Seward, C., 2009. The Relational Ontology of Amartya Sen's Capability Approach: Incorporating Social and Individual Causes. J. Hum. Dev. Capab. 10, 213–235.

Sonne, L., 2012. Innovative initiatives supporting inclusive innovation in India: Social business incubation and micro venture capital. Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change 79, 638–647.

Srinivas, S., Sutz, J., 2008. Developing countries and innovation: Searching for a new analytical approach. Technol. Soc. 30, 129–140.

Swain, R.B., Varghese, A., 2009. Does Self Help Group Participation Lead to Asset Creation? World Dev. 37, 1674–1682.

Tidd, J., Bessant, J.R., 2009. Managing innovation: integrating technological, market and organizational change, 4th ed. John Wiley & Sons Inc, Chichester.

Utz, A., Dahlman, C., 2007. Promoting Inclusive Innovation in India, in: Utz, A. (Ed.), Unleashing India's Innovation: Towards Sustainable and Inclusive Growth. World Bank, Washington, D.C.

van Maanen, J., 1988. Tales of the field : on writing ethnography, Chicago guides to writing, editing, and publishing. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Varma, R., 2001. People's Movements and Science Wars? Econ. Polit. Wkly. 36, 4796–4802.

Wallerstein, I., 2004. World-System analysis. An introduction. Duke University Press, Durham and London.

Winner, L., 1980. Do Artifacts Have Politics? Daedalus 109, 121–136.

World Bank, 2012. Inclusive Green Growth. The pathway to Sustainbale Development. Washington, D.C.

Yunus, M., 2010. Building Social Business. The new kind of capitalism that serves humanity's most pressing needs. The Univerty Press Limited, Dhaka.

Appendix A

Data collected

Methods	Data collected	Concepts studied and induced
Case 1: Mother Earth (ME)		
Observations	Observations of 7 management meetings, 4 months of observation of Self-Help Groups (SHG) activities, production activities (field notes, video and photos).	Norms, values, routines, organizational capabilities, collective practices
Semi-structured interviews with Mother Earth executives	2 interviews	Strategy, corporate values, goals and motivations
Semi-structured interviews with Mother Earth production and supply-chain managers	16 interviews	Innovation strategy, sources and purpose, organization of production, capability building process
Documentary evidence	Internal reserved and public documents, newspapers articles and websites links	Organizational strategy, communication and legitimation of narratives
Case 2: Indian Institute of Management Bangalore (IIMB)		
Documentary evidence	Teaching materials, IIMB business case studies, publications	Scientific outcomes, framing of innovation for development
Semi-structured interviews with IIMB faculty staff	10 interviews	Origin of the innovation discourse in an Indian context, the role of academia in the debate about innovation management and the discourse of innovation for the poor in relation to the notion of inclusive business
Semi-structured interviews with NSRCEL social entrepreneurs	6 interviews	Organizational strategy, communication and legitimation of narratives, corporate values, goals and motivations
Case 3: People's Science Movements (PSM)		
Semi-structured interviews with PSMs activists	9 interviews	Innovation strategy, sources and purpose and framing of science & technology.

Observation	3 weeks of non-participant observation, dissemination material, case studies, photos, videos	Norms, values, routines, organizational capabilities, collective practices